OUTLINES

OF THE

HISTORY OF EARLY BABYLONIA

BY

ROBERT W. ROGERS PH. D. (LEIPZIG) D.D.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS
IN DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY MADISON,
NEW JERSEY U.S.A.

DS71
.R75

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division DS71

Section R75

OUTLINES

OF THE

HISTORY OF EARLY BABYLONIA

Library of Princeton Theological Seminary
12.15.97

BY

ROBERT W. ROGERS PH. D. (LEIPZIG) D.D.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS
IN DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY MADISON,
NEW JERSEY U.S.A.

LEIPZIG
THEODOR STAUFFER
1895.

This Work was accepted by the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Leipzig as a Dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

TO MY DEAR MOTHER

A SMALL TOKEN OF GREAT GRATITUDE
AND AFFECTION.

PREFACE.

For the past five years I have been collecting materials for a large history of Babylonia and Assyria, which should be consistently based upon original sources, while it also gave fitting attention to all investigations, however slight, of all previous students of this subject. The collection of these materials has involved the careful reading of great stores of Babylonian and Assyrian texts in which any historical material was likely to be found; and also the painstaking collection of every paper written by my colleagues in such investigation in many and widely separated places. My notes upon the texts themselves and upon previous discussions or translations of them fill hundreds of pages of manuscript. Up to this time the requirements of academic instruction and the frequent demands upon my time for various forms of public service, have prevented the writing out and the publishing of the history, but the labor of its preparation has gone on as constantly as other duties would permit.

A small outline study of the history of one part of Mesopotamia is here published, not in any sense as a specimen of the larger book, but distinctly as a separate study of perhaps the most difficult portion of all Babylonian and Assyrian history. It is to be judged not by the canons used in estimating a larger work, in form, style and breadth, but solely as an *outline* study based upon honest and long continued labor. They who have themselves worked longest and hardest

over the fragmentary and often almost illegible texts of these early periods, will be most just and lenient in their judgments. The notes, with references to texts and discussions of them, were all written in the honest endeavor to give full credit to all my predecessors. If I have failed in any case to do so, the failure is accidental and reparation will be gladly made in the final publication of the history. The little piece of work here given, deals rather with results than with processes, and this fact will justify some of the more obvious omissions in the references.

In the discussions of material and the grouping of facts into a theory of political development I have been continuously indebted especially to the works of Hugo Winckler and Hermann V. Hilprecht. The former has exhibited extraordinary ability in the unravelling of the tangled threads of early kingdoms and, if not always right in the final result, is always instructive. The latter, whom I am proud to have had as one of my own teachers, has shown himself to be a historian, as well as a masterful philologist.

The Bibliography makes no claim to completeness, but is intended merely to point the way to materials for other students, who desire to test some of the results. It was written at a long distance from my own library and some of the smaller articles are therefore wanting.

There are many marks of haste in this little work, but its writing had thus to be done and apology is sincerely made for any injustice to any worker thereby caused.

My sincerest thanks are due to my friend and teacher Professor Albert Socin, for much encouragement and stimulus; and to Professor Zimmern for criticism, correction and help with the proofs.

Leipzig, July 11, 1895.

Robert W. Rogers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. The History of Babylonia to the Fall of Larsa, pp. 1—24.

Introduction (1), Sargon (3), Naram-Sin (6), Alusharshid (9), Lagash (11), Urkagina (11), Ur-Bau (12), Gudea (13), Ur (15), Urbau of Ur (16), Dungi (16), Amnanu (17) Singashid (17), Isin (18), Kingdom of the Four Quarters of the World (18), Larsa (19), Nur-Ramman and Sin-iddina (20), Kudur-Marbuk (20), Rim-Sin (20), Sumerian (22), Political Development of Babylonia (23), Sumer and Akkad (23, 24).

CHAPTER II. The First and Second Dynasties of Babylon, pp. 25—34.

Origin of Babylon (25), Sumu-abi (26), Hammurabi (27), The public works of Hammurabi (28), Samsu-iluna (30), End of First Dynasty (32), Second Dynasty (32), Character of Second Dynasty (34).

CHAPTER III. The Kassite Dynasty, ... pp. 35—62.

The beginning of the Dynasty and Origin of the Kassites (35—37), Gandish, first king of the Dynasty (38), Agu (39—43), The King List 44, 45), Assyria (45—47), Mitanni (47—49), Karadunyash (49, 50), Karaindash (50—53), Kallima-Sin (53), Burnaburiash II and Amenophis IV (56), Kurigalzu II (58), Invasion of Babylonia by Tukulti-Ninib (60), Last Kings of the Dynasty (60—62).

CHAPTER IV. The Dynasty of Pashe, ... pp. 64—67.

Origin of the Dynasty of Pashe (63), Number of Kings (63), First two kings (64), Nebuchadnezzar I (64, 65), Marduk-nadin-akhe (65, 66), Remaining Kings of the Dynasty (66, 67), Conclusion (67).

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE . . . . . pp. 68—71.

LITERATURE.

I. Original Documents.

1. The Inscriptions of Western Asia, edited by Sir Henry Rawlinson. Five volumes London, 1861—1894.
2. *Winckler*, Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna, autographirt von Ludwig Abel, I, II, III. Berlin, 1889—1890.
3. The Tell-el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum with Autograph Facsimiles. London, 1892.
3. The Babylonian Chronicles.
   - [S.] 1. Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. Vol. III. p. 361 ff. [Smith].
   - [B.] 2. Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. Vol. VI. pp. 193 ff. [Pinches.]
   - 3. Zeitschrift für Assyriologie. II. pp. 148 ff. [Winckler].
   - 4. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. Vol. XIX. p. 655 ff. [Pinches].
   - 5. Abel-Winckler, Keilschrifttexte. pp. 47, 48.
   - [P.] 6. Records of the Past, new series. Vol. V. pp. 106 ff. [Pinches].
   - 7. Altorientalische Forschungen. pp. 115 ff. and pages 297 ff. [Winckler].
   - 8. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. October, 1894. pp. 807 ff. [Pinches].
4. The Babylonian King Lists.
   A and B.
   - 1. Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. 1884. pp. 193—204. [Pinches].
   - 2. Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Ak. der Wissenschaften. 1887. pp. 579—607. [Schrader].
   - 3. Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott [Knudtzon]. Band I und II. Leipzig, 1894.
   - 4. Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. 1888. pp. 22 ff. [Pinches].
5. *Winckler*, Altbabylonische Keilschrifttexte. Leipzig, 1891.

6. *Hilprecht*, Old Babylonian Inscriptions. Vol. i pt. 1. Philadelphia, 1893.
7. *De Sarzec-Heuzey*, Découvertes en Chaldée. Paris, 1887.
8. *Lehmann*, Šamaššumukin I und II. Leipzig, 1892.
9. *Ludwig Abel und Hugo Winckler*, Keilschrifttexte zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen. Berlin, 1890.

II. Histories.

1. *Curt Wachsmuth*, Einleitung in das Studium der Alten Geschichte. Leipzig, 1895.
2. *Tiele*, Babylonisch-assyrische Geschichte. Gotha, 1886, 1888.
3. *Hommel*, Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens. Berlin, 1885.
4. *Winckler*, Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens. Leipzig, 1892.
5. *Meyer*, Geschichte des Alterthums. Band 1. Stuttgart, 1884.
6. *Mürdter-Delitzsch*, Geschichte Babyloniens, 2te Aufl. Calw und Stuttgart, 1891.
7. *Sayce*, A Primer of Assyriology. New-York, n. d.
8. *Hommel*, Geschichte des alten Morgenlandes. Stuttgart, 1895.
9. *Maspero*, The Dawn of Civilization. New-Yerk, 1895.
10. *Hommel*, Die Semitischen Völker und Sprachen. Leipzig, 1883.
11. *Hommel*, Abriss der Geschichte des Alten Orients bis auf die Zeit der Perserkriege (Sep.-Abdr. aus Iw. v. Müllers Handbuch der klass. Altertumswissenschaften, Bd. iii). Nördlingen, 1887.
12. *Mc Curdy*, History, Prophecy and the Monuments. New-York, 1894.
13. *Billerbeck*, Susa. Leipzig, 1893.

III. Investigations and Discussions.

1. *Winckler*, Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte. Leipzig, 1889.
2. *Delitzsch*, Wo lag das Paradies. Leipzig, 1881.
3. *Winckler*, Mittheilungen des Akademisch-Orientalischen Vereins zu Berlin. I. 1889.
4. *Winckler*, Altorientalische Forschungen, i, ii, iii. Leipzig, 1893—1895.
5. *Winckler*, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Assyriologie in Deutschland.
6. *Mez*, Geschichte der Stadt Harran. Strassburg, 1891.
7. *Delitzsch*, Assyriologische Miscellen (Sonderabdruck aus den Berichten der philolog. hist. Klasse der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Sitzung vom 8. Juli 1893).
8. *Delitzsch*, Die Sprache der Kossäer. Leipzig, 1884.
9. *Bezold*, Kurzgefasster Überblick über die Babylonisch-Assyrische Literatur. Leipzig, 1886.
10. Records of the Past, new series. Vol. i—vi. London n. d.

11. Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. Band i, ii, iii. Berlin, 1889—1892.
12. *Hilprecht*, Assyriaca, i. Boston, 1894.

VI. Journals etc.

1. Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
2. Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.
3. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
4. Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
5. Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleich. Sem. Sprachwissenschaft.
6. Journal of the American Oriental Society.
7. Johns Hopkin's University Circulars.
8. Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale.
9. Revue Sémitique.

CHAPTER I.

The History of Babylonia to the Fall of Larsa.

The study of the origins of states is fraught with no less difficulty, than the investigation of the origins of animate nature. The great wall before every investigator of the beginnings of things, with its inscription, "thus far shalt thou come and no farther" stands also before the student of the origins of the kingdom of Babylon. It may always be impossible to achieve any picture of the beginnings of civilization in Babylonia which will satisfy the desire for a clear and vivid portrayal. Whatever may be achieved by future investigators it is now impossible to do more than give outlines of events in the dim past of early Babylonia.

If we call up before us the land of Mesopotamia, and transport ourselves backward until we reach the period almost four thousand years before Christ we shall be able to discern, here and there, signs of life, society and government in certain cities. At this time there is no large kingdom, comprising many cities,

with their laws and customs, with subject territory and tribute paying states. Over the entire land there are only visible, as we look back upon it, cities dissevered in government and perhaps in intercourse, but yet the promise of kingdoms still unborn. In northern Babylonia we know of the existence of the cities Agade, Babylon, Kutha, Ursagkalama and Kish, while yet others achieve position so soon that they also must have been founded. Evidence is also not lacking for the existence of the far distant fortress of Haran,—the Road-Town through which passed the traffic of later days between the Mesopotamian valley and Egypt. As we shall shortly see there is also one little ray of light from the land of Guti. In each of these cities worship is paid to some local god who is by his faithful followers considered to be the Baal or Lord, the strongest god, whose right it is to demand worship also from the dwellers in other cities.[1] This belief becomes an impulse by which the inhabitants of a city are driven out to conquer other cities and so extend the dominion of their god. If the inhabitants of Babylon could conquer the people of Kutha, was it not proof that the stronger god was behind their armies, and should not other peoples also worship him? But there was another motive for conquest,

[1] Winckler, *Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte.* Leipzig 1889. p. 65.

—the thoroughly human desire for power. The ruler in Babylon must needs conquer his nearest neighbor that he may get himself power over men and a name among them. Impelled by religion and by ambition, the peoples of Babylonia who have dwelt apart in separate cities, begin to add city to city, concentrating power in the hands of kings. Herein lies the origin of the great empire which must later dominate the "whole earth",—for these little kingdoms thus formed, later unite under the headship of one kingdom and the empire is thus founded.

The first king whose figure becomes at all clear to our eyes is Shargâni-shar-âli, or, as he is also called Shargina, and even his figure is shadowy. Most of that which is told of him comes to us in an astrological text,—hardly the place to which one would commonly go for sober history. But a little sifting of this source, speedily reveals its historic basis. The text,[1] two copies of which are in existence, belongs to a much later date than that of the king himself. It was probably written in the Eighth Century B. C., and purports to be a copy of an inscription which was found by the copyist upon a statue of the great

[1] Published III R 4. No. 7. It has been frequently translated e. g. by George Smith, *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* i. pp. 46, 47, by Fox Talbot, *Records of the Past*, first series Vol. v pp. 1 ff. Delitzsch, *Paradies* pp. 209, 210. Winckler, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, 1, pp. 100—103.

king. The story begins in this way. "Shargina, the powerful king, the king of Agade am I. My mother was poor, my father I knew not; the brother of my father lived in the mountains. My town was Azupirani, which is situated on the bank of the Euphrates. My mother, who was poor, conceived me and secretly gave birth to me, she placed me in a basket of reeds, she shut up the mouth of it with bitumen, she abandoned me to the river which did not overwhelm me. The river bore me away and brought me to Akki, the drawer of water. Akki, the drawer of water, received me in the goodness of his heart. Akki, the drawer of water, reared me to boyhood. Akki, the drawer of water, made me a gardener. My service as a gardener was pleasing unto Ishtar and I became king and during . . . —four years held royal sway. I commanded the black-headed people and ruled them." In the fragmentary lines which follow, he relates some of the important conquests of his reign and among them names Dur-il and Dilmun, the latter an island in the Persian Gulf. This account is supplemented by a story of expeditions to Syria and Palestine, in which three years were spent, and even to Cyprus. The Lebanon also is reached, and the mountains ascended for their valuable timber. Soon after his return a rebellion broke out which was happily quelled by the help of Ishtar, ever his protecting deity. It has been

maintained by some that Shargina, or Sargon, and his great deeds are purely legendary;[1] by others that his deeds have been simply projected backwards[2] from some later king and have therefore no historical value. There is however no valid reason for doubting the main facts concerning the king's achievements. That he actually existed is placed beyond question by the discovery of several of his own brief inscriptions.[3] No good reason for doubting that he was a great conqueror, East, South and West has been brought forward. On the other hand when these same omen tablets refer to his son and successor they can be tested by texts of the king referred to, and prove to be worthy of credence. The allusions to these expeditions show that they were simply raids intended to gain plunder, with which to increase the wealth and beauty of his home cities. It is not to be supposed that he made any effort to extend his dominion over lands so distant as Northern Syria, but that the securing of great cedar beams from the Lebanon was the chief object of that expedition.

[1] So, for example, Winckler, *Gesch. Babyloniens und Assyriens*, p. 38.

[2] Hommel supposes the existence of another king Sargon whom he locates about 2000 B.C., whose conquests he believes were ascribed to the earlier king (*Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, Berlin 1885, p. 307, note 4). Maspero believes that it is Sargon II (722—705 B.C.) who is thus projected backward. (*Dawn of Civilization*, Eng. Trans. New-York 1895, p. 599.)

[3] Published by Winckler, *Altbabylonische Keilschrifttexte*, p. 22 and by Hilprecht, *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, plates 1—3.

A use for these cedar beams was soon found in buildings. The great temple of Ekur to the god Bel in Nippur[1] and the temple of Eulbar to the goddess Anunit in Agade[2] were built by him. Other allusions to buildings erected by him are also to be found in later inscriptions. In warlike prowess he was the model for an Assyrian king who bore his name centuries later; in building skill he was emulated by a long line of Babylonian kings even unto Nabonidus, who sought diligently to find the foundation stones which he had laid. In Sargon there are no doubt to be seen traces of myth, but that is surely no reason for doubting all that is told of him. A lonesome figure he is, in the dull gray dawn of human history, stalking across the scene, bringing other men to reverence the name of Ishtar, and making his own personality dreaded.

Sargon was succeeded by his son Naram-Sin about 3750 B.C.,[3] who seems to have maintained in some

[1] Hilprecht *ib* plate 2 and p. 15.

[2] This fact is mentioned in an inscription of Nabonidus I R. 69, iii, 29, 30.

[3] This date was secured in the following manner. In 1881 Mr. Hormuzd Rassam found in the mound of Abu Habba, thirty miles southwest of Baghdad, on the Euphrates, two terra-cotta cylinders of the last king of Babylon, Nabonidus (555—538 B.C.). In one of these inscriptions Nabonidus describes the finding of the foundation stone of Naram Sin in the temple of the Sun in Sippar. He affirms that this stone had not been seen for 3200 years. If Nabonidus made his discovery in 550 B.C. this would place the date of Naram Sin at 3750 B.C. The first note on this discovery was made by Pinches (*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* v, pp. 8, 9, 12).

degree the glory of his father's reign. The records of his reign are fragmentary, which may perhaps have resulted from their composition during the reign of the king himself.[1] He is asserted to have invaded the city of Apirak, and to have carried the people into slavery after he had killed their king Rishram-man. His chief warlike expedition known to us was into the land of Magan,—which appears to lie in the eastern part of Arabia near the Persian Gulf.[2] He was also famous as a builder, rebuilding temples in Nippur and in Agade[3] and erecting at his own cost the temple to the sun god in Sippar.[4] Of the extent of his kingdom it is now impossible to form any clear idea. His chief city was Agade, but he also held

There has been much debate over this date, which may now be said to be accepted on almost all sides. It is maintained, for example, by Tiele (*Geschichte*, p. 114) by Hommel (*Geschichte*, pp. 166, 167, 309, 310) and by Delitzsch (*Geschichte*, pp. 72, 73). Only Winckler continues to doubt (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 44, 45 and *Geschichte*, pp. 37, 38, 42). Maspero has well summed up the entire discussion in the weighty words: "There is at present no serious reason to question its accuracy [i. e. the date], at least relatively, except the instinctive repugnance of modern critics to consider as legitimate, dates which carry them back further into the past than they are accustomed to go." (*Dawn of Civilization*, p. 599, note 4.)

[1] So Sayce in Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, p. vi and in *Primer of Assyriology*, London and New-York n. d. p. 44.

[2] The location of Magan and of Melukhkha, a country frequently named with it, has been the subject of great and still continued controversy. For literature *cf.* Maspero *ib.* p. 564, note 3.

[3] Hilprecht OBI. i, plate 4.

[4] VR. 64, i, 57, 60. It is to be noted that the facts concerning the campaigns of Naram Sin come from the omen tablet (IV R. 34, Col. ii, 15—18), while the facts concerning building come from the king's own inscriptions.

sway in Babylon, Nippur and in Sippar. Nothing is known of the successors of Naram Sin. The kingdom of Sargon and his son vanishes from our view as rapidly as it came, leaving not even a trace of its effects.

But at about this same period, nearly four thousand years before Christ, we catch a glimpse of another conqueror in Babylonia. At Nippur[1] there have been found sixty one fragments of vases bearing the name of the king Âlusharshid.[2] From the fragments of these vases a complete inscription has been made out, which reads "Âlusharshid, king of Kishshati,[3] presented (it) to Bel from the spoil of Elam, when he had subjugated Elam and Bara'se." This inscription

[1] By the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania under Dr. Peters. (*cf.* Hilprecht *ib.* p. 19.)

[2] The signs with which the name is written are URU-MU-USH, the reading of them as Âlusharshid, as well as the translation of the inscription, belongs to Hilprecht (*ib.* p. 20).

[3] The phrase šar Kiššati here translated King of Kishshati is still of somewhat uncertain meaning. More light has been cast upon it by Winckler than by any other scholar. His papers (*Mittheilungen des Akademisch-Orientalischen Vereins zu Berlin*, I. p. 14. *Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte*, pp. 65—90. *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 75—97, 140—158 and especially 201—243. *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Assyriologie in Deutschland, passim. Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, pp. 82, 149) have set forth the entire question in so clear and convincing fashion that further study of the question *without new material* seems almost wasteful. Winckler has demonstrated the location of the title in Northern Mesopotamia, and made it seem probable that the capital was Haran. Mez (*Geschichte der Stadt Harran*, p. 27) and Hilprecht *ib.* p. 23. have not disproved this view. See also Jensen, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* viii, pp. 228, 229.

makes known the important fact that a king living probably in northern Mesopotamia conquered part of the land of Elam and the unknown land of Bara'se (or Para'se), from which he brought back fine marble vases and dedicated them to the gods in his own land. It is undoubtedly confirmatory of the accounts of Sargon and his victories to find these conquests of Âlusharshid thus set forth.[1] It is also significant that these vases are dedicated to gods in Nippur and in Sippar,[2] for in this we find indications of the extent of a kingdom which included northern Mesopotamia, Nippur, Sippar and extended its influence even over the land of Elam. And with these few faint rays of light from the north and its kingdom, darkness again closes in upon early Babylonia.

Once more, at about the same period,[3] do we get sight of a bright light in the gray dawn of history, and this time it is not from Babylonia but from Guti, a land east of the river Lower Zab.[4] Here reigned a king whose words are thus read: "Lasirab (?) the

[1] Hilprecht has well argued this point (*op. cit.* p. 22).

[2] Inscriptions of Âlusharshid have also been found in Sippar. *Academy*, Sept. 5, 1891, p. 199, P.S. (see Hilprecht *ib.* p. 21.)

[3] The credit of publishing the text of the inscription here referred to belongs to Winckler (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* iv, p. 406), but Winckler misunderstood and wrongly dated it at about 1600 B.C. (*Geschichte* p. 82). Hilprecht correctly translated, and located it by palaeographical evidence (*op. cit.* pp. 12, 13).

[4] On the location of Guti see Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* pp. 233—237.

mighty king of Guti, . . . has made and presented (it). Whoever removes this inscribed stone and writes (the mention of) his name thereupon, his foundation may Guti, Ninna and Sin tear up and exterminate his seed, and may whatsoever he undertakes not prosper." In itself brief and unimportant this little text introduces us to another land under Semitic influences at a very early period.

Sargon, Naram-Sin, Alusharshid, Lasirab, from these shadowy figures in the dawn of history come "the first syllables of recorded time." After them there is a great silence and a deep darkness. For centuries in all that land we can discern no figure and hear no sound. In some later day, as the work of explorer goes on, there may yet come a little more light into the dark place. But though few kings only are known and of their deeds little has been heard, and that often merely an echo, nevertheless certain important and broad generalizations may, with some confidence, be drawn. Three thousand eight hundred years before Christ a Semitic civilization is in possession of at least northern Babylonia, of Guti, of parts of Elam and of a portion, at least, of Northern Mesopotamia. Whatever may be said later of the influence of Sumerian civilization at a late date in Southern Babylonia it is clear that in the north the Semite was in control at an extremely early date.

This would certainly seem to indicate that the Semitic race entered Babylonia from the north and not from the south. The evidence is however insufficient for a decisive answer.

From Northern Babylonia we turn now to Southern Babylonia and pass over several centuries of time. About 3500—3300 B.C.[1] there was growing up a powerful and highly civilized kingdom with its centre at Lagash.[2] The first king of Lagash of whom we have any knowledge was Urkagina[3] (3100 B.C. [?]) who restored and enlarged temples and dug canals to supply his city with water. He, and the kings who follow him for a considerable space are little more than names to us at this great distance. They base their own claim to remembrance chiefly upon their devotion to the gods and their zeal in the building

[1] The date is very uncertain. Hommel places the early kings at about 4200 B.C., but without sufficient reason (*Geschichte* p. 291), Hilprecht believes that these kings ruled even before Sargon and asserts that they were conquered by him and reduced to the rank of vicegerents (*op. cit.* p. 19), but for this view, he has, as yet, produced no sufficient evidence. Winckler with much greater force locates them at about 3100 B.C. (*Untersuchungen* p. 43) while Maspero in general agrees with him and places them at about the same period, locating Urkagina at 3200 B.C. (*Dawn of Civilization* p. 604, 605 note 3).

[2] The name of this town has been read in many different ways and is still uncertain. It has been called Sirpurla, Zirgulla, Sirbulla, Shirpurla etc. See references in Maspero *ib.* p. 603.

[3] Urkagina is placed third in the list of these kings by Hommel (*Geschichte* p. 291), but without good reason. We follow Heuzey (*Revue d'Assyriologie* ii, pp. 78—84) in placing him first. This has also been accepted by Jensen (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, iii pt. 1., pp. 7, 8, 10).

of temples. In a short time Lagash became a dependency of some other city, and her rulers ceased to call themselves kings and adopted the title of *Ishakku*, which seems in its usage in Southern Babylonia to mean little more than vicegerent. To what city Lagash had yielded up its autonomy is entirely unknown. It may have been Ur[1] which must at this time have been making progress toward the power it was soon to display. Among these vicegerents in Lagash two are known to us as men of power and distinction, Ur-Bau and his son Gudea. Of the former we possess a long inscription, of six columns,[2] engraved upon the back of a small statue of the king, which has been wrought with considerable skill out of dark green dolerite. Like other inscriptions of the same period it contains but little material for historical purposes. There is no word of battle and war; all is peace serene in these ancient texts. It is not however to be supposed that the lot of these kingdoms was thus happy. It must always be remembered that even unto the end the kings of Babylonia did not write

[1] This is the opinion of Amiaud (*Sirpurla* pp. 12, 13) and of Maspero (*op. cit.*, p. 609). Hilprecht thinks it was Sargon. For he locates the kingdom of Lagash before that of Agade.

[2] Published by Heuzey in De Sarzec *Découvertes en Chaldée* plates 7, 8, copied and translated by Amiaud in the same work. See also Y. Le Gac in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* vii, pp. 125 ff., and Jensen *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, pt. 1., pp. 19 ff. *Revue d'Assyriologic et d'Archéologie Orientale* ii, pp. 124—135 and iii, pp. 42—48.

accounts of their wars. From other sources we know well that Nebuchadnezzar was a great soldier, but in only a single one of his own inscriptions does he speak of aught else but buildings of palaces and temples and dedications to the gods. The inscriptions of Gudea are similar to those of Ur-Bau in their subjects but they give us incidentally a glimpse into a wider field. In the building of his temples Gudea was directed by a divine vision. The goddess Nina appeared to him in a dream and showed him the complete model of a building,[1] which he should erect in her honor. In the execution of this plan he brought from Magan, (north eastern Arabia), the beautiful hard dolerite out of which his statues were carved. From the land of Melukhkha, or north western Arabia, were brought gold and precious stones. These lands were not far from his own, but it is more surprising to read that he brought from Mount Amanus in North-western Syria great beams of cedar and in other neighboring mountains quarried massive stones for his temples. All these facts throw a bright light upon the civilization of his day. That was no ordinary civilization which could achieve work requiring such skill

[1] Gudea A, published by Amiaud in De Sarzec *Découvertes en Chaldée* p. vi plates 20 and 13 and p. 134. The credit of first explaining the exceedingly difficult expressions in this text which refer to the dream belongs to Zimmern (*Traumgesicht Gudea's* in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* iii, pp. 232—235).

and power as the quarrying or the cutting of these materials and the transportation of them over such distances. A long period for the development of such power must be assumed. Centuries only and not merely decades would suffice for the period of preparation for such accomplishements. But it is also to be observed that the securing of these materials must have involved the use of armed force. The sturdy inhabitants of the Amanus would not probably yield up their timber without a struggle. One little indication there is of the prowess in arms of Gudea, for he conquered the town of Anshan in Elam.[1] This single allusion to conquest is instructive, for it was probably only representative of other conquests by the same builder and warrior. The successor of Gudea was Urningirsu, himself followed rapidly by other vicegerents ending finally in Galalama. These later vicegerents were all vassals of the kings of Ur. With them has ended the power of Lagash as a separate kingdom.

The civilization of Lagash was, as we have seen, a high one. From the indications which we possess at present it was a far higher civilisation than that of Agade which preceded it in time. But it was not a Semitic civilisation. All these inscriptions of the kings and of the *Ishakke* of Lagash are written in

[1] Gudea B col vi, 64—66. Compare Jensen (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, pt. 1., p. 38, note 9).

the Sumerian and not in a Semitic language. This also would seem to point to the conclusion that the Semites entered Babylonia from the north and not from the south.

From Lagash the power passed to Ur.[1] This city was admirably situated to achieve commercial and historical importance. The river Euphrates flowed just past its gates, offording easy transportation for stone and wood from its upper waters, to which the Lebanon, rich in cedars, and the Amanus were readily accessible. The Wady Rummein came close to the city and linked it with Central and Southern Arabia, and along that road came gold and precious stones; and gums and perfumes to be converted into incense for temple worship. Another road went across the very desert itself and, provided with wells of water, conducted trade to Southern Syria, the peninsula of Sinai and across into Africa. This was the shortest road to Africa and commerce between Ur and Egypt passed over its more difficult but much shorter route than the one by way of Haran and Palestine. Nearly opposite the city the Shatt-el-Haî emptied into the Euphrates and so afforded a passage for boats into the Tigris, thus opening to the commerce of Ur the

[1] The ruins of Ur, now called Mugheir have long been known. They were first explored by Taylor and Loftus. The early references to Ur and its commerce have been collected by Hommel (*Die Semitischen Völker und Sprachen*, pp. 204–211 and *Geschichte*, pp. 212—218, 325—329).

vast country tributary to that river. Here then were roads and rivers leading to the north, east and west, but there was also a great outlet to the southward. The Euphrates made access to the Persian Gulf easy. No city lay south of Ur on that river except Eridu, and Eridu was no competitor in the world of commerce, for it was devoted only to temples and gods, —a city given up to religion.

In a city so favorably located as Ur the development of political as well as commercial superiority seems perfectly natural. About 2900 B.C. we find ruling in Ur a king named Urbau.[1] Like his predecessors in other cities his boast was in the building of new temples and the repairing of old ones. The temple of the Sun god at Larsa, the temple of Nina in Uruk and temples in Nippur were built or restored by him. The great temple of the moon god, in Ur was founded by him and the walls of the city were built by him. Of his wars and conquests we hear no word. His son Dungi[2] was also indefatigable in building operations. He completed the temple of

[1] The reading of the name of this king has been a bone of contention during the entire history of Assyrian study. It has been read "Urukh", "Urkham", "Orkham". "Urbagas", "Urbabi", "Likbabi", "Amilapsi", "Urea", "Likbagas" etc. Recently the forms "Urbau" and "Urgur" have most commonly prevailed, but the question is not definitely settled. Inscriptions of this king are published I R 1 and translated by Winckler *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, pt. 1., pp. 77 ff.

[2] The inscriptions of Dungi are published I R 2 and translated by Winckler *ib.*, pp. 81 ff.

the moon god in Ur; and built also in Uruk, Lagash and Kutha. These two names of Urbau and Dungi are all that remain of what was perhaps a considerable dynasty in Ur. Their buildings would seem to indicate that they held at least nominal sway over a considerable part of Babylonia. It is probable, however, that they were contented with the regular receipt of tribute and did not attempt to control all of the life of the cities subject to them, which still retained their former kings in the capacity of vicegerents.

At about the same period as these kings of Ur, there was also in existence a small kingdom, called the kingdom of Amnanu[1] with its chief city Uruk. The names of three of its sovereigns have come down to us upon brief inscriptions,[2] the chiefest of them being apparently Singashid. Unlike the kingdoms founded in Ur and in other cities, this kingdom of Amnanu seems to have exerted but small influence upon the historical development of the country. The name of the kingdom disappears, and is borne by no later king until it is suddenly used again by Shamashshumukin (669—647 B. C.),[3]—but apparently without any special

[1] Cf. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 231, 232.

[2] 1 R 2, No. viii 1, 2. IV R 35, 3, Brit. Mus. 82, 7—14, 181, copied by Peiser. All these are translated by Winckler *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, pt. 1, pp. 84, 85.

[3] V R 62, No. 2 line 2. Cf. Lehmann *Šamaššumukin* II. Theil, Tafel I and II.

significance,[1] and rather as a reminiscence of ancient days.

Soon after Dungi the power seems to be transferred from Ur to the city of Isin,—whose site has not yet been determined. The kings of Isin whose names have come down to us, Ishbigarra, Ur-Ninib, Bur Sin I. and Ishme-Dagan all claim, by various titles, rule over Ur, Nippur and Isin. The brief inscriptions of this dynasty which have been preserved give little else but the titles of the kings with an occasional note concerning their building operations.

The last king of this dynasty acknowledges his dependence upon Gungunu king of Ur, who seems to have been the founder of the second dynasty of Ur. To this dynasty belong the names of Gamil-Sin and Bur-Sin II. (so named to distinguish him from Bur-Sin I. of the dynasty of Isin). Of these kings we know but little. Both call themselves, "king of the Four Quarters of the World" adding this title to the usual one "king of Ur". It would seem that we have here an indication of the existence of some other kingdom. Where was the kingdom of the "Four Quarters of the world", and why do these kings use such a title? The same title appears earlier in an inscription of Naram Sin, while a text of Dungi found at Kutha bears the same curious legend. Again and again in

[1] See Winckler as above and cf. Lehmann *ib.* I. Theil, p. 75.

later centuries is this title worn by kings of Babylonia and Assyria. It cannot be a mere idle boast that the king who used it had conquered the whole earth. It must be the actual name of some kingdom with a definite geographical location and a capital city, which may perhaps have been more or less changeable. All indications point to North Babylonia as the location, and to Kutha as its capital city. It would seem therefore that the kings of this second dynasty in Ur had come from northern Babylonia, perhaps even from Kutha. Having set up their rule in Ur, by conquest, they continue also to use the title by which they were known in the land of their origin.[1] The relations in which they stand to each other and to Gungunu are entirely unknown, and only the usual building and restoration is ascribed to them. The end of this dynasty and with it, the end of the domination of Ur is clouded in the mists of the past.

After Ur, in the progress of the development of empire in Babylonia, came the dominion unto Larsa, the modern Senkereh on the bank of the canal Shatt-en-Nîl. The names of only two kings of the dynasty in Larsa are known to us, Nur-Ramman[2] and Sin-

[1] This title of šar kibrat irbitti has been most thoroughly examined by Winckler. See references above on šar kiššati. Hilprecht suggests Ursagkalama as the capital (*op. cit.*, p. 26).

[2] Published I R, 2, No. IV and translated by Winckler in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, p. 91.

iddina.[1] The latter of these two kings besides the customary temple building also dug a new canal between the Tigris and the Shatt-en-Nîl. This work of canal building, which became so important and so highly prized in the later history, begins therefore at this early period. The king who built canals, saved the land from floods in the spring and from drought in the summer and was a real public benefactor. The other kings of this dynasty in Larsa are unknown to us as so many of their predecessors in other cities of Southern Babylonia. When, in the changing fortunes of the centuries Larsa lost its headship in Babylonia it was lost not to another city in the same land, as had previously been the case. This time a foreign invader seized the supremacy, and made Babylonia tributary to Elam.

About 2300 B. C. Larsa was conquered by Kudur-Mabuk, prince of Emutbal, the western portion of the land of Elam. His son, Rim-Sin, was made king of Larsa, and in all things continued the dignities and powers of the old kingdom of Larsa. As though born to the customs of Babylonia he continued the repairs to temples and the collection of tithes for the priesthood. No other kings of the dynasty are known to us. The name of Kudur-nankhundi[2] of Elam preser-

[1] An inscription of this king is published and translated by Delitzsch in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* I, pp. 301 ff.

[2] III R. 38, 1. a. 12—18.

ved by Ashshurbanipal is the name of a king who ravaged, but did not rule in Southern Babylonia.[1] The invasion of Babylonia by the Elamites prepared the way for the conquest of Southern Babylonia by the North.

With Larsa ends the series of small states, of whose existence we have caught mere glimpses, during a period of more than a thousand years. As Maspero has well said,[2] "we have here the mere dust of history, rather than history itself: here an isolated individual makes his appearance in the record of his name, to vanish when we attempt to lay hold of him; there the stem of a dynasty which breaks abruptly off, pompous preambles, devout formulas, dedications of objects or buildings, here and there the account of some battle, or the indication of some foreign country with which relations of friendship or commerce were maintained,—these are the scanty materials out of which to construct a connected narrative." But though we have only names of kings of various cities and faint indications of their deeds, we are able nevertheless out of these materials to secure, in some measure, an idea of the development of political life and of civilization in the land.

[1] The name of Chedorlaomer preserved in Genesis XIV corresponds exactly in form to an Elamite name Kudurlagamaru, but the name of no such king has yet been found elsewhere.

[2] *Dawn of Civilization*, pp. 619, 620.

As has already been said, the civilization of Southern Babylonia in the period 3500—2300 B.C., was at the foundation Sumerian. But it was Sumerian influenced by Semitic civilization. The northern kingdom even about 3800 B.C. was Semitic. Intercourse was free and wide extended, as the inscriptions of Sargon and Naram Sin and the operations of Gudea have conclusively shown. The Sumerian civilization was old, and the seeds of death were in it; the Semitic civilization, on the other hand, was instinct with life and vigor. The Semite had come out of the free airs of the desert of Arabia at some time prior to 4000 B.C., and had in his veins a bounding life. It was natural that his vigorous civilization should permeate at first slowly, and then rapidly, into the senile culture of the Sumerians. Even the earliest of the Sumerian inscriptions give evidence of Semitic influence. Here it is a word borrowed from the Semitic neighbors, there it is a name of man or god. This influence increased. Toward the end of the period the Semitic words are frequent, the Semitic idiom is in a fair way to a complete peaceful conquest. Political contest was to bring about the final triumph of Semitism, but not the extermination of Sumerian influence. That influence remained until the very end of Babylon itself and the rise of the Indo-European world powers. The conservatism of religious customs

gave the old language and the old literature, now become sacred, an artificial life. The temples still bore Sumerian names when Babylon's last conqueror entered the magnificent gates.

Of the political development we know very little. The whole may be summed up in these words. The earliest indications show us the city as the centre of government. The chief man in the city is its king. When the surrounding country is annexed his title still remains the same; he is still king of the city. But with the early kings of Ur a new custom begins. Urbau is king of Ur, but he is more, he is also king of Sumer and Akkad. This last phrase is not geographical, it is political. It is the name of the kingdom of which Ur is the chief or capital city. Sumer and Akkad has indeed a geographical situation, and this situation is in Southern Babylonia. Sumer and Akkad is however the political name, not the geographical name, of a country in Southern Babylonia. This kingdom had its governmental centre at first in Ur, but Ur was not its permanent capital. The capital is later found in Isin and the kings of Isin are then kings of Sumer and Akkad. In the same way Larsa becomes the capital and its kings bear the title of kings of Sumer and Akkad, when they have conquered and bear rule in Southern Babylonia. This old political title lives on through the centuries and later

kings in other cities are proud to carry upon their inscriptions this ancient title.[1]

This union of all Southern Babylonia under one king was not the means of creating a national unity strong enough to resist the outside invader. Sumerian civilization seems to have reached the end of its development as a political factor. The raids of the Elamites scattered and broke its power and the time was ready for a man strong enough to conquer the petty kings of Larsa, take the title of king of Sumer and Akkad and make a strong kingdom.

[1] The credit of first correctly understanding and rightly setting forth the facts with reference to the title of king of Sumer and Akkad belongs to Winckler, who has set forth his views in the following publications: *Mittheilungen des Akademisch-orientalischen Vereins zu Berlin* 1889, *Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte*, pp. 65—90, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 75—97, 140—158 and especially pp. 201—243, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, pp. 19, 20 etc.

CHAPTER II.

The First and Second Dynasties of Babylon.

The origin of the city of Babylon is veiled in impenetrable obscurity. The first city built upon the site must have been founded fully four thousand years before Christ, and it may have been much earlier. The city is named in the Omen tablet of Sargon,[1] and though this is no proof that the city was actually in existence about 3800 B.C., it does prove that a later tradition assigned to it this great antiquity. At this early date, however, it seems not to have been a city of importance. During the long period of the rise of the kingdom of Sumer and Akkad no king in the south finds Babylon worthy of mention. But Babylon must have been developing into a city of influence during the later centuries of the dominion of Isin and Larsa. From the year 2400 B.C., the influence of this city extends almost without a break to the period of the Seleucides. No city in the world has ever been the centre of so much power, wealth and culture for a period so vast. It is indeed a brilliant cycle of centuries upon which we enter.

[1] IV R. 34, obverse l. 8.

The name of the first king of Babylon is given in the Babylonian king lists as Sumu-abi (2399—2385 B.C.),[1]—of him we know nothing. Of his immediate successors we have no historical inscriptions, and our only knowledge of their reigns is to be obtained from the fragmentary notes of contract tablets, which sometimes give indications of the life of the people during their reigns. From the inscriptions of later kings we also get word of some building operations of two of them. These kings are Sumula-ilu (2384—2350 B.C.) who built six strong fortresses in Babylon;[2] Zabu (2349—2333 B.C.) who erected in

[1] The dates which are set down with the names of the kings of the dynasties which follow, must in all cases be taken as approximate only. Though this true, the error in most cases must be very slight. The dates here given rest upon an independent study of the original Babylonian and Assyrian documents and a study of the inscriptions of kings who have furnished us with chronological data of various kinds. As the author intends to publish later a full discussion of the Babylonian and Assyrian Chronology he contents himself here with the addition of notes to certain of the dates giving, in some places, hints of the bases on which the dates rest, and in others explanations of cross references by which the dates are more strongly fixed. In the study of these questions of Chronology Winckler has done great service. See, especially, his papers in *Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte*, pp. 1—46, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 75—97, 109—138, 264—277. Hilprecht has also made important contributions in the introduction to his *Old Babylonian Inscriptions* and in *Assyriaca*. References to the original texts and to the discussions of Pinches, Sayce, Peiser, Jensen, Schrader, Bezold and others are given below in connection with certain names in the list.

[2] This fact is recorded by Samsu-iluna (Col. iii line 7) in an inscription which exists both in Babylonian (Winckler, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 140, 141) and in Sumerian (published by Strassmaier, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* iii. pp. 140, 153—157).

Sippar of Anunit, the temple of E-dubar to the city's deity; Abil-Sin (2325—2318 B.C.) and Sin-muballit (2317—2288 B.C.)

The son and successor of Sin-muballit was Hammurabi (2287—2233 B.C.), with whom begins a new era. It is the chief glory of his name that he made a united Babylonia, and that the union which he cemented remained until the sceptre passed from Semitic hands to another race. About 2250 B.C. Hammurabi conquered Rim-Sin, the last king of Larsa, and the kingdom of Sumer and Akkad was united to the kingdom of Babylon. The struggle must have been brief and without distinction. The people of Sumer and Akkad had no genuine national life, no divine patriotism. When one king passed, they cared not; and as willingly paid taxes to another if only he made them no heavier. The ready acquiescence of the people in the new rule of Hammurabi and the new leadership of the city of Babylon is shown conclusively by the entire absence of any uprising or of any attempt to throw off the yoke. The time was ripe for the overturning of the old Sumerian state; for the Sumerian civilization was dead, and in Hammurabi was found the man for its accomplishment. The manner of the conquest is unknown to us and in the knowledge of the fact we must rest content.

As soon as the conquest of Sumer and Akkad was completed, Hammurabi showed himself the statesman even more than the soldier. He displayed extraordinary care in the development of the resources of the land, and in thus increasing the wealth and comfort of the inhabitants. The chiefest of his great works is best described in his own ringing words,—the words of a conqueror, a statesman and a patriot. "Hammurabi, the powerful king, king of Babylon, . . . when Anu and Bel gave unto me to rule the land of Sumer and Akkad and with their sceptre filled my hands, I dug the Canal Hammurabi, the Blessing-of-Men, which bringeth the water of the overflow unto the land of Sumer and Akkad. Its banks upon both sides I made arable land, much seed I scattered upon it. Lasting water I provided for the land of Sumer and Akkad. The land of Sumer and Akkad, its separated peoples I united, with blessings and abundance I endowed them, in peaceful dwellings I made them to live."[1] This was no idle promise made to the people before the union of Sumer and Akkad to Babylon, but the actual accomplishment of a man who knew how to knit to himself and his royal house the hearts of the people of a conquered

[1] The Louvre inscription Col I, 1—II, 10. See for full references to the original texts Jensen in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, pt. 1. p. 123 with translation, and compare also translation by Winckler (*Geschichte*, p. 64).

land. There is a world of wisdom in the deeds of this old king. No work could possibly have been performed by him which would bring greater blessing than the building of a canal by which a rainless land could be supplied with abundant water. After the building of the canal, Hammurabi followed the example of his predecessors in Babylonia and carried out extensive building operations in various parts of the land. On all sides we find evidences of his efforts in this work. The temples of the Sun in Larsa and in Sippar were rebuilt by him, while the Ishtar temple in Zaulab was extended. The great temples of E-sagila and E-zida in Babylon showed, in increased size and in beauty, the influence of his labors. There is evidence also that he built for himself a Palace at the site now marked by the mount of Kalwadha, near Baghdad.

But these buildings are only external evidences of the great work wrought, in this long reign, for civilization. The best of the culture of the ancient Sumerians was brought into Babylon and there carefully conserved. What this meant to the centuries that came after is shown clearly in the later inscriptions. To Babylon the later kings of Assyria look constantly as to the real centre of culture and civilization. No Assyrian king is content with Nineveh and its glories, great though these were in later days,

his chiefest glory came when he could also call himself king of Babylon, when the symbolic act of taking hold of the hands of Bel-Marduk had been accomplished. Nineveh was the centre of a kingdom of warriors; Babylon the abode of scholars, and the well spring of all this is to be found in the works of Hammurabi. But if the kings of Assyria looked unto Babylon with longing eyes, yet more did later kings in the city of Babylon itself look back to the days of Hammurabi as the golden age of their history. Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar acknowledged the power of this great king in the most flattering way. They imitated in their inscriptions the very words and phrases in which he had described his building, and, not satisfied with this, even copied the exact form of his tablets and the manner of the writing. In building, his plans were followed; and in rule and administration, his methods were imitated. His works and his words entitle him to rank as the real founder of Babylon.[1]

The long reign of fifty five years ended, and the son of Hammurabi entered into his father's labors. Samsu-iluna (2232—2198 B.C.) seems to have followed closely in the footsteps of Hammurabi. The single inscription[2] of his which has come down to us, tells

[1] See Winckler, *Geschichte*, pp. 63, 64.

[2] Published by Winckler, *Untersuchungen*, p. 140 and translated by him in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, pt. 1. p. 131 ff.

only of building in Nippur and in other cities, whose localities are still unknown to us. The profound peace which Hammurabi achieved by arms, continues through his reign and into the reigns of his successors. Of the remaining kings of this dynasty we have no inscriptions. The only records belonging to their reigns are the so—called contract, or business, tablets from which no connected story has yet been made out. The names and the dates only, can be set down until some future discovery reveals records with a historical meaning.

Ebishum	2197—2173 B.C.
Ammisatana	2172—2148
Ammisadugga	2147—2127
Samsusatana	2126—2096[1]

With these kings ends the first dynasty of Babylon.

[1] The names of the kings of this dynasty are preserved for us in the following original documents. (1) The Babylonian King List A now preserved in the British Museum (80, 11—12, 3). It was first published by Mr. Pinches (*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 1884, pp. 193—204). A lithograph of the important tablet and a careful criticism of its contents was given by Schrader (*Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Ak. der Wissenschaften*, 23. Juni 1887, pp. 579—607). This republication rested upon Schrader's own collation of the original. It is again published by Winckler (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 146, 147) and a transliteration by Schrader is published in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* ii, pp. 286—287. Still another publication of the text, after collation with the original is presented by Knudtzon (*Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott*, Band i, p. 60). For the notes by Delitzsch, who also collated the original see references below. (2) The Babylonian King List B first published by Pinches in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 1888, pp. 22 ff. It is discussed also by Schrader and Winckler. See references under King List A above.

According to the king lists this dynasty was followed immediately by the Second Dynasty, which in all things must have been very like unto its predecessor. It is called the dynasty of Shish-Ku.[1] The names of the kings and their periods are as follows:

Ma-ilu	2094—2035 B.C.
Ki-anni-bi	2034—1980
Damki-ilishu	1979—1944
Ish-kibal	1943—1929
Shushi	1928—1902
Gul-kishar	1901—1847
Kirgal-dara-bar	1846—1797
A-dara-kalama	1796—1769
Akur-ul-anna	1768—1743
Milam-kurkurra	1742—1736
Ea-gamil (?)	1735—1727.[2]

[1] Winckler reads Uru-azagga and supposes this to be a part of the city of Babylon (*Geschichte*, pp. 67, 68, 328). See on this Hilprecht's criticism, *Assyriaca*, pp. 25—27, 103. To this Winckler replies in *Altorientalische Forschungen* iii, pp. 275—277. Sayce supposes Uruazagga to be represented by "a part of the mounds of Tello or its immediate vicinity" (*Records of the Past*, new series i, p. 13). Hommel has attempted to connect the first king of this Dynasty, here read Ma-ilu, with Prince An-a-an of Erech (*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Vol xvi, pp. 13—15) but without success. The meaning of *Shishku* is unknown, and the origin of the dynasty and the meaning of its existence remain therefore undetermined. The various hypotheses put forth by scholars have found in no single case any general acceptance.

[2] This list is taken from Babylonian King Lists (A and B). For references see above. It is the opinion of Hommel that this Second Dynasty is contemporary with the first dynasty. (Compare his *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, p. 176 with his *Geschichte des Alten Morgenlandes*, pp. 59, 60 and also his, *Aus der babylonischen Altertumskunde*

We owe this list of kings and the length of each reign to the Babylonian historians. It is certainly a surprising list of years of reign. Were it not for the confidence awakened in these records by their oft repeated testing and their power to stand these tests, we should doubt a list that showed such extraordinary reigns. But there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of any of these figures. No inscriptions of any of these kings have yet been found, and no business documents dated in their reigns have come to light. The future probably has much in store in these directions.

This must have been a period of profound peace, or kings could not have lived and reigned so long. Hammurabi had indeed builded well. North and South together acknowledged the dominion of his successors. Peace at home and abroad gave leisure for the pursuit of literature, art and science. This great silent period gives the necessary time for the progress in all these things, which is evidenced by the works no less than the words of the following centuries. But toward the end of the period there is evidence that a change was impending. The last two reigns are only six and nine years respectively.

München 1895, Sonder-Abdruck aus der *Aula*, pp. 11 ff). His attempt to prove this thesis, though keen, has not been successful. For the present compare Winckler, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 7 ff. To the discussion of Hommel's reasons we shall return again in another place.

These form a great contrast to the reigns which precede. Their brevity may be an indication of war; just as the extreme length of the preceeding reigns seemed a sign of peace. Future discovery will probably reveal the fact that in these reigns the disturbances and invasions began, which resulted in the great foreign domination in Babylon, which next confronts us as we survey the progress of life and the movements of peoples in Mesopotamia.

CHAPTER III.

The Kassite Dynasty.

With the year 1727 ends the long period of stable peace, during which Babylonia was ruled by kings of native blood. This land of great fertility had tempted often enough the hardy mountaineers of Elam, even as in later centuries the fair plains of Northern Italy tempted the Teutons, who surveyed them from the mountains above. As long as the influence of Hammurabi, and the other founders of the united kingdom of Babylonia remained, the country was able to defy any invader. But the development of the arts and the progress of civilization and the increase of commerce had weakened the military arm. Babylon was becoming like the Tyre of later days, whose merchants were always willing to pay tribute to a foreign foe rather than run the risk of a war which might injure their trade. At this time however Babylon had not reached that point. There was still patriotism and national pride; and there is no reason to believe that the foreigner seated himself upon the proud throne

of the Babylonians without difficulty. It is indeed unlikely that the conquest of Babylon was achieved by a definitely organized army led by a commander who purposed making himself king of Babylon, while still continuing to reign in his own country. It is rather the migration of a strong fresh people which here confronts us. This people is called the Kashshu, and their previous seat was in northern Elam. Certain indications there are, which seem to show that they did not come direct from their ancient home into Babylonia, but were first settled in the far South near the Persian Gulf. They were not Semites. It seems probable that they stood in some relation to the people dwelling along the banks of the Zagros, who became famous in later times under the name of the Kossaeans,[1] and it is also probable that they are, in some way, to be connected with another people, the Kissians who were settled about Susa. In the present state of our knowledge we are, however. not justified in identifying them absolutely with either or both of

[1] Delitzsch believes that these are all one people (*Die Sprache der Kossäer*, p. 4). But see, for reasons to the contrary, Oppert (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* iii, 421 ff and v, 106 f) and also Lehmann (*ib.* vii, 328 ff). The name Kassite, which we have here adopted is colorless and leaves the question undecided, until more light has been obtained. It was proposed by Sayce (*Records of the Past* new series I, p. 16) but he nevertheless identifies them with the Kossaeans (*ib.* note 7). Kassite is used by Winckler (*Geschichte*, p. 78, 79) and Hilprecht (Cassite) *Old Babyloniam Inscriptions* i, p. 28. M^{c} Curdy (Kasshites) *History Prophecy and the Monuments* i, p. 143.

these peoples. It will be safer simply to call them Kassites, and thus leave their racial affinity an open question. They enter Babylonia at first probably as roving bands, then in increasing numbers they overrun the land and gain control so that they set up a foreign dynasty in place of the previous native Babylonia rule.

Concerning this Kassite dynasty our knowledge is very unsatisfactory. The Babylonian historians preserved in their king lists the names of all these kings, but unhappily this list, in the form in which we possess it, is badly broken and many of the names are lost. The list assigns to this dynasty five hundred and seventy six years and nine months, so that, upon this representation the Kassites must have ruled until 1019 B.C. Of only one king in this dynasty do we possess any long historical inscription, and, as it chances, his name does not appear upon the king List, but stood where the List is broken beyond hope of restoration. Of the remaining kings we possess only some contract tablets, the number of which will be largely increased by the publication of the collections of the University of Pennsylvania.[1]

The names of the first kings in the list are as follows:

[1] A volume of these tablets is promised by Hilprecht and one of his pupils (*Assyriaca*, p. 74 and note 1).

1. Gandish[1] 1726—1711 (16 years)
2. Agum-machir 1710—1689 (22 years)
3. Aguiashi (?)[2] 1688—1667 (22 years)
4. Dushi (?)[3] 1666—1659 (8[?]years)
5. Adumelik[4] 1658— ? (? years)
6. Ur-ziumash[5]

After this sixth name the list is hopelessly broken and no names can be read for a considerable space. It has been suggested that this name Urziumash may be the same name as Tashshigurumash (see note 5 below). If this be true we may have found by this

[1] The name of this king is also abbreviated into Gande (Hilprecht *Old Babylonian Inscriptions* i, pt. 1, pp. 28 ff.) and even into Gan (*ib.* p. 30). It seems also to be the same name as Gaddash on an inscription published by Pinches (*Babyl. and Orient. Record* i, pp. 54 and 78; cf. *Academy* 1891, p. 221). The inscription is in the British Museum (84-2-11, 178) and is published by Winckler (*Untersuchungen*, p 156, No. 6). See further Hilprecht, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* vii, p. 309 note 4 and *Old Bab. Ins.* i, pt. 1, p. 30 note 3.

[2] This name is mistakenly written Gujashi by Pinches and Winckler. There is however another sign discernable before the GU, so Delitzsch, (*Assyriologische Miscellen.* Sonderabdruck aus den Berichten der philolog.-hist. Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Sitzung vom 8. Juli 1893, p. 184).

[3] The second sign in this name is certain; the first is doubtful. It has usually been read "Ush". Knudtzon (*Assyrische Gebete* i, p. 60) says that "Du" seemed more probable to him; while Delitzsch suggests that it may be "ad".

[4] The fifth name in the list is also doubtful. Winckler reads Adumetash.

[5] The reading of this name is doubtful, though the signs may be seen with reasonable certainty. Winckler reads Tash-shi-gurumash because in the Inscription of Agum (Kakrime) the latter calls himself a son of Tash-shi-gurumash, a name so like this that they may, without violence, be thought the same. (Delitzsch, *Assyriologische Miscellen*, p. 185).

means the name of the next king in the list. There belonged to the library of Ashurbanipal a long inscription[1] in Assyrian which purported to be a copy of an inscription of an early king of Babylon. Certain peculiarities of the Assyrian text make it much more probable that it is a translation from Sumerian into Assyrian.[2] The king whose deeds it recounts was Agu, or as the name stands in the beginning of the text Agum-kak-rime,[3] of which the *Kakrime* seems to be an appellative, meaning Second or Junior. In this text Agu calls himself the son of Tashshigurumash. It is very tempting to connect this Tashshigurumash with the sixth name in the list of kings, but this is doubtful. If Agu were really the son of *king* Tashshigurumash, it is natural to suppose that with his father's name in his inscription would stand the title of king, which is not the case. The entire inscription sounds rather like the text of an usurper who is attempting to bolster up his claims to the throne by

[1] This text was first published II R. 38 No. 2, and repeated in more perfect form V R. 33. It was collated by Delitzsch and then translated in *Kossäer*, pp. 55 ff. It was again collated by Bezold and, upon his contributions, translated by Jensen (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* iii, pt. 1, pp. 134 ff). For further literature see Bezold (*Ueberblick*, p. 57).

[2] Winckler (*Geschichte*, p. 79).

[3] The meaning of this word *Kakrime* (if it be correctly so read) is unknown. It can hardly be an integral part of the name for the king elsewhere (e. g. Col. vii line 11) calls himself simply Agum (i. e. Agu with mimmation). The expression *Agum rabi*, i. e. Agum the elder, also occurs (Col I, l. 19).

sounding titles and genealogical connections, as was done in some cases in later times.[1]

Whether Agu was the next name in the List or not, it seems almost certain that he must have belonged in this same period, and his name must have followed very shortly upon the list. After he has given all his connections of blood and all his ties to the gods, he sets forth the lands of his rule in these words: "King of Kashshu and Akkad; king of the broad land of Babylon; who settled the land of Umliash with much people; king of Padan and Alvan; king of Guti, of the rebellious (?) people; a king who rules the Four Quarters of the World am I." This is a remarkable list of titles. It is at once noteworthy that the titles do not follow the usual Babylonian order. A Babylonian king would have written the title in this fashion: "king of Babylon, king of the Four Quarters of the World, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of Kashshu," the titles "king of Padan and Alvan, king of Guti etc." would not have been used in this form at all, for no Babylonian king could bear title over a land lying outside of the rule of the Babylonian gods,—who alone could give the title to a king in Babylon. Rather would such a king have called himself "king of the kings of Padan, Alvan and Guti," which lands he would thus rule through a deputy

[1] So, e. g., by Sargon II and Tiglathpileser III.

appointed by himself. It is to be observed that the later Kassite kings conformed very carefully to this custom.[1] That Agu violated it, is another proof that he belongs among the earlier kings of the dynasty, in a time before the Kassites had accommodated themselves to the customs of their conquered land.

But the titles of Agu serve another purpose for us, than the furnishing of a confirmation of the position we have assigned him in the dynasty; they furnish us with a view of the extent of territory governed from Babylon during his reign. His kingdom covers all Babylonia, both north and south, which belonged to the ancient empire of Hammurabi; but it far exceeded these bounds. Agu still continued to rule the land of Kashshu, which covered north-western Elam, and the land of Umliash, in the border country between Elam and Babylonia. Guti also, a land of which we have heard no word since the days of Lasirab, was also subject to him, as well as Padan and Alvan (modern *Holwan*), which were contiguous to Guti and lay in the highlands of Media. Of Mesopotamia in its largest sense, only the land of Kishshati and the small territory of Assyria are not included in it. As there is no indication in the inscriptions of the previous dynasties that so large a territory

[1] These distinctions are due to the keenness of Winckler (*Geschichte*, pp. 80, 81).

had been added to Babylonia since the days of Hammourabi, we are shut up to the view that the Kassites had themselves achieved it.

The major part of this inscription of Agu deals with the restoration to Babylon, of some gods which had been carried away in a previous attack upon the country. Agu says that he sent an embassy to the far away land of Khani, which brought back to Babylon the statues of Marduk and Ṣarpanit. In order to the understanding of this move on his part, it must be remembered that, from the Babylonian point of view, there could be no legitimate king in Babylon unless he had been appointed to his rule by Marduk, patron god and real ruler of the city. But Marduk had been carried away by the people of Khani. It was all important therefore for the stability of the throne that this god, at least, be immediately restored. If Agu had had sufficient troops at his command, he would probably have taken the god by force from his captors; as Nebuchadnezzar I. and Ashurbanipal did in later times. He did not do this, but sent an "embassy"—in this expression we may see an euphemism for the purchase or ransom of the gods by actual payment of gold and silver. When these gods were taken away we do not know. Perhaps we shall not be far astray if we locate this event during the reign of Milam-kurkura or of Ea-gamil, in which time we have

also placed the beginnings of the Kassite influence. The gods must have been removed by a destructive invasion, for Agu follows the story of their resteration, with the statement that he placed them in the temple of Shamash, and provided them with all the necessities for their worship. This temporary location was provided because Marduk's own temple, E-sagila, had to be restored before it was fit for his occupancy. This ruinous state of Babylons great temple points backward to a period of great weakness, to the period when Babylon was tottering from the proud position to which Hammurabi had brought it, and was already an easy prey for the foreigner.

The remaining lines of this important inscription deal with the temple restorations, and thus add the name of Agu to the list of the great builders who have already passed in review before us. No other events in his reign are known to us, nor is its length preserved. The indications which remain, would seem to indicate that he must have reigned long and peacefully.

After the reign of Agu there is a sharp break in the chain of our information concerning the history of this dynasty. It will be necessary to make clear the reason for this break, and to set forth briefly the means adapted for, at least, the partial repair of the breach.

In giving the names of the kings of this dynasty

from Gandish to Agu, we have simply followed the lists made up by Babylonian scholars in ancient times. If the list were perfectly continued we should have an easy task in following out the kings of this dynasty, and in setting forth something of their activity by means of other historical material. Unhappily, however, the tablet containing the list (British Museum 80, 11—12, 3) is broken just after the name of Urziumash. The list is then resumed after some distance by the name of Isamme .... ti (?) alongside of whose name stands the numeral VI as the number of years of his reign. Before this name the regnal years of four kings are preserved (though these are somewhat doubtful), but the names are lost. Following the name Isamme .... ti (?) there are preserved the names of ten kings of the Kassite dynasty, with the years of reign of all of these but two, and besides these the years of four kings whose names are lost. There are thus preserved, all told, the names of seventeen kings. At the bottom of the list it is stated that there were thirty-six kings in the dynasty, and that the sum of the years of their reigns was five hundred and seventy six years and nine months. For the completing of the list we therefore need the names of nineteen kings. One of these (Agu) we have already secured, and apparently have correctly located him in point of time. How many of the remaining names can be

obtained? In the present state of investigation, it is safe to say that of these eighteen missing names fourteen have been secured with reasonable certainty, and for the most part these can be accurately arranged in the dynasty. These names have been secured in some instances from Contract tablets in their reigns; in others from their own inscriptions; in others from the so-called Synchronistic History—an original Assyrian document giving very briefly the early relations between Babylonia and Assyria—in others from letters and despatches which passed between the courts of Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt. In their proper places these methods for the identifying of certain kings will all be mentioned. The dates we have given below must always be considered as approximate only, but in the case of many of the names the years must be very exact, for the cross references to the inscriptions of the kings themselves, the king List and sundry allusions in the inscriptions of other Assyrian and Babylonian kings serve as sure means for their verifying.

Before proceeding to the history of the remaining kings of this dynasty it will be necessary to say something, by way of preface, of the conditions of political life prevailing elsewhere, in order to the better understanding of the facts which we possess with reference to these reigns.

More than one hundred years before the beginning

of the Kassite dynasty a new state, destined to a splendid career of dominion among men, was showing the beginnings of its life along the western bank of the Tigris. The land of Assyria in its original limits was a small land enclosed within the natural boundaries of the Tigris, the Upper and the Lower Zab, and the Median mountain range. Its inhabitants at this time were Semites, and apparently of much purer blood than their relatives the Babylonians who had intermarried with the Sumerians,—a custom afterward continued with Kassites and with many other peoples. The chief city of this small Assyrian state was Ashur, in which were ruling, at the period of the beginning of the Kassite dynasty, Semitic kings who were the beginners of a long and distinguished line. Their land was admirably furnished by nature. The lowlands near the Tigris were abundantly supplied with water, for not only did they possess the great river itself, but also numerous small streams which discharged their waters into it. The spring overflow enriched the lowlands, so that they became like unto Egypt itself after the subsiding of the Nile. Here grew in profusion the products of the sub-tropical, one might even say of the tropical zone. Above the fields of vegetables, watered by the numerous small canals, which a thrifty people provided, was to be seen the leafy crown of the Palm,—a tree which nature made

to supply almost all the wants of men in a tropical climate. Beyond the lowlands, as the country rose toward the mountains, the fig and the olive rewarded the husbandmen; while vineyards clothed the slopes, and melted away into the pasture lands of the mountain sides. With a temperate climate above, and an almost tropical climate below, the land was burdened with plenty. The wealth of the tropical zone, was added to the strength of the temperate zone. In such a land lived a people who were not enervated by luxury, nor prostrated in energy by excessive heat, but accustomed to battle with snow drifts in the mountains and to conserve their physical force by its constant use. It is no wonder that under such favorable conditions this people should have risen rapidly to power. In a short time we shall find them able to negotiate treaties with the kings of Babylonia. It is for this reason that we have here touched lightly upon the beginnings of their national life.

Two other lands require brief mention, before we can properly understand the movements of races during the period of the Kassite dynasty.

In northern Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and the Euphrates, north of the city of Harran, was the small kingdom of Mitanni.[1] Of its origin we know nothing. How long a people had lived within its

[1] Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, p. 86, note 1.

narrow borders with kings of their own, and a separate national existence, remains an enigma. No inscriptions of the people of Mitanni save letters written to kings of Egypt, have yet been found. We should indeed hardly know of the existence of the land at all, but for the discovery of the Royal archives of the kings Amenophis III and Amenophis IV,—the kings of Egypt who had diplomatic intercourse with it. From these letters and despatches we have learned the names of several of the kings of Mitanni;—among them Artatama, Artashuma, Shutarna, and Dushratta.[1] Between some of these and the kings of Egypt there were bonds of marriage, the kings of Egypt having married princesses from the little land of Mitanni. The fact that the proud kings of Egypt were anxious to ally themselves to the kings of Mitanni, would seem to indicate that the land was sufficiently wealthy, or influential, to make it worthy of the attention of Egypt. The letters of Mitanni were written chiefly in the Semitic language of Babylonia, and in the cuneiform characters, with which we are familiar in the native inscriptions. One of these letters, however, preserved in the Royal Museum in Berlin,[2] is written in the

[1] Several letters of Dushratta are preserved in the British Museum (BU. 88—10—13, 70, 78, 79) in Berlin (VA. Th. 190, 191, 233, 271, 340, 395, 422) and one in private possession in Luxor (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* vii, pp. 117—124).

[2] VA. Th. 422.

language of Mitanni, which has thus far not yielded to the numerous efforts made to decipher it.[1] It is interesting to possess this one voice, from a language so long dead; and these few records of men so long passed from the sight of mortals. The kingdom of Mitanni must take its place among the small states which have had their share in influencing the progress of history in the orient, but whose own history we are unable to trace. But, while we cannot trace its history, we may at least observe that it seems to have been largely under Semitic influences. Its god Ramman is connected with the Semitic Pantheon; and its method of writing was borrowed from its powerful neighbors.

The last land to which our attention must be diverted, before proceeding with the history, is the land of Karadunyash.[2] As was the case with the land of Mitanni, so also here have we unsatisfactory knowledge of the origin and antiquity of the kingdom of Karadunyash. The land itself lies in southern Babylonia, close to the Persian Gulf, in later times it is called by the Assyrians the Sea Land, and is identical with Kaldi, the land of Chaldea, out of which

[1] Attempts to decipher this language have been made by Sayce, always a pioneer (*Academy*, Vol 37, 1890, p. 94. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* V, pp. 260—274), by Jensen (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* V, pp. 166—208, VI, pp. 34—72) and by Brünnow (*ib.* V, pp. 209—259).

[2] Winckler, (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 135, 136. *Geschichte*, pp. 86, 87) For references to the El-Amarna letters from Karadunyash see below.

came a people who founded the last great Babylonian Empire. The name of Karadunyash has the Kassite ending, "ash." It has been supposed, and with good reason, that the Kassites had first settled in this land by the Persian Gulf, and had used it as the base from which to overrun and conquer Babylonia. Whether this be true or not, it is, at least, certain that the Kassite dynasty did not rule the land of Karadunyash during the entire period of their rule in Babylon. Some of the Kassite kings are also kings of Karadunyash, while at other times we find kings in Karadunyash who seem to be entirely independent of the kings in Babylon, even though their names would seem to indicate that they belonged to the same race. We are now able to return to the Kassite dynasty after a long Excursus.

As we have seen above, the Babylonian King List is so broken after the name of Urziumash, that some names are lost. Of these missing names we have already secured the name of Agu. After his name there are lost two, or perhaps three, names of kings with all their works and words.

The next king of the Kassite dynasty of whom we have knowledge, is Karaindash (about 1450 B.C.). Like his predecessors and successors he was a builder. His own brief inscription makes this plain. "To Nana the goddess of E-Anna, his mistress, built Karaindash,

the powerful king, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of Kashshu, king of Karadunyash in E-anna a temple." In this brief inscription it is to be especially observed that the king places Babylon first in his list of titles, and the two lands of Kassite rule, Kashshu and Karadunyash, at the very last. This gives a clear proof of how thoroughly, in two centuries, the Kassites had accustomed themselves to the usages of Babylonia. The old culture land soon absorbed the peoples who came into it as conquerors, and by the potency of its own civilization and the power of its religion compelled abherence to ancient law and custom. The Kassites had conquered Babylonia by force of arms; already has Babylonian culture conquered the Kassites and assimilated them to itself.

In the reign of Karaindash we meet for the first time evidences of contact between the still youthful kingdom of Assyria, and the empire of Babylon—even then hoary with age. Our knowledge of these relations between the two kingdoms comes from the Assyrians, who made, during the reign of Rammannirari III (812—783), a list of the various friendly and hostile relations between Babylonia and Assyria from the earliest times down to this reign. The original of this precious document has perished, but a copy of it was made for the library of Ashurbanipal, by some of his scholars, to whom our knowledge of

the ancient Orient owes so much. This copy is now in the British Museum, and, though badly broken, fully half of it may be read.[1] It has been named the Synchronistic History, and, though it is not a history in any strict sense, it is convenient to retain this appellation. The very first words upon it, which can be read with certainty, relate to Karaindash and are as follows: "Karaindash, King of Karadunyash and Ashurbelnisheshu, King of Assyria, made a treaty with one another, and swore an oath concerning this territory, with one another." In all this Synchronistic History the Kassite kings are called Kings of Karadunyash and not Kings of Babylon, being thus named from their old home. This first entry evidently refers to some debateable land between the two countries, concerning which there had been previous difficulty. The two kings have now by treaty settled the boundary line. This shows that Assyria was already sufficiently powerful to claim a legitimate title to a portion of northern Mesopotamia, in its broadest sense, and that it was acknowledged by Babylon as an independent kingdom. It is not long until this small kingdom of Assyria begins to dispute with Babylonia for the control even of the soil of Babylonia itself. With this first notice of relations between the two king-

[1] Published II R. 65, 1 and R. 4, 3. See also Delitzsch Kossäer, pp. 6 ff and the translation by Peiser and Winckler, (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* I, pp. 194 ff) which is based on a new collation by Winckler.

doms begins the series of struggles, whether peaceful or warlike, which never cease till the bloodthirsty Assyrian has driven the Babylonian from the seat of power and possessed his inheritance.

Very shortly after Karaindash, perhaps with the loss of only one or two names, follows Kallima-Sin. No historical inscription of this king and no business document dated in his reign has yet come to light in Babylonia. We should be at loss to locate him at all, were it not for the assistance again to be obtained from the archives of the Egyptians. As in the case of the land of Mitanni, so also here are we in possession of some portions of a correspondence with Amenophis III, king of Egypt. The British Museum possesses a letter written in Egypt by Amenophis III to Kallima-Sin and the Berlin Museum has three letters from Kallima-Sin to Amenophis III. Whether the first letter was never sent, or whether the one in our possession is a copy of the original, we do not know. It begins in this stately fashion: "To Kallima-Sin, king of Karadunyash, my brother; thus saith Amenophis, the great king, the king of Egypt thy brother: With me it is well. May it be well with thee, with thy house, with thy wives, with thy children, with thy nobles, with thy horses and with thy chariots, and with thy land may it be very well; with me may it be well, with my house, with

my wives, with my children, with my nobles, with my horses, with my chariots, with my troops and with my land, may it be very well."[1] The letter then discusses the proposed matrimonial alliance between Egypt and Babylonia, and urges that Kallima-Sin should give to him his daughter Sukharti to wife. The letter further announces the sending to Kallima-Sin of an ambassador, to negotiate a commercial treaty between the two states, by which certain imports from Babylonia into Egypt were to pay a customs duty. The letters preserved in Berlin seem to relate to the same correspondence, and deal chiefly with the proposed marriage of the daughter of Kallima-Sin to Amenophis III, to which friendly consent was finally given. To find letters passing between Babylon and Egypt about 1425 B.C. and ambassadors endeavoring to negotiate commercial treaties, does indeed give us a wonderful view into the life of the distant past. This all witnesses to a high state of civilization; to ready intercourse over good roads; to firmly fixed laws and stable national customs. It gives us however no light upon the political history of Babylonia, which is the object of our present search, and we must pass from it. Kallima-Sin had a long reign covering at least thirty six years. His name is not Kassite, but

[1] The original is in the British Museum (BU, 88—10—13, 43) and is published in "*The Tell el Amarna Tablets in the British Museum*", pp. 2—5. See Bezold's transliteration "*Oriental Diplomacy*", pp. 1—3.

Babylonian. Why he should have adopted a Babylonian name, if he was Kassite, while the kings before and after him still retained names indicating their origin, is unknown. It is difficult to find any other explanation of the anomaly, for it is unlikely that the dynasty was interrupted at this point by a native Babylonian king.

Kallima-Sin was apparently succeeded, on the throne of Babylonia, by Burnaburiash I. The Synchronistic History sets this king as contemporary with Puṣur Ashur, king of Assyria, with whom he seems to have had a hostile demonstration concerning the boundaries between the two lands. As the Assyrian writer alludes only euphemistically to their relations as unfriendly, and says nothing of an Assyrian victory, it is perhaps safe to conclude that Burnaburiash was successful. Little else of his reign is known, though he also was, in a measure, a builder of temples.

Of the next king Kurigalzu I, son of Burnaburiash I, our knowledge is also very unsatisfactory. It is known from the letters of his son and successor, that he stood in friendly relations with Amenophis III of Egypt. The few inscriptions of his which remain[1] record simply the usual building operations. The titles

[1] I R 4, Lehmann, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* V, 417, and Hilprecht, OBI, pl. 20 etc.

which he uses in his texts are "king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the Four Quarters of the World," to which, in one instance he adds the title "*shakkanak* (i. e. governor) of Bel," and in another case uses this latter title only. The title of king of Babylon, which we might have expected, is not used by him at all. This may be because he was not officially made king, —placed on the throne by the god of the city, according to the usual Babylonian religious ceremony.

The next king of Babylon was Burnaburiash II (1397—1373?). Four letters written by this king to Amenophis IV king of Egypt are preserved in the Berlin Museum[1] and two more are in the British Museum.[2] No historical material of moment is offered in these letters. They reveal a period of relative peace and prosperity, and deal, in considerable measure, with the little courtesies and amenities of life. It is, for example, curious to find the Babylonian king reproving the king of Egypt, for not having sent an ambassador to enquire for him when he was ill.[3] When kings had time for such courtesies, and could only excuse themselves, for failing to observe them, on the ground of their ignorance of the illness and

[1] VA. Th. 149, 150, 151, 152. *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna*, Heft 1.

[2] BU. 88—10—13 Nos. 21, 46 and 81.

[3] VA. Th. 150, 10 ff. translated by Zimmern, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* V. p. 139.

the great distance to be covered on the journey, there must have been freedom from war and from all distress at home and abroad.

Of the next kings, Kudur-Turgu (1372—1365?) and Shagarakti-Buriash (1364—1348)[1] we have no direct information. Kara-Khardash (1347—1338) had for his chief wife Muballitat-Sheru'a, daughter of Ashur-uballit king of Assyria, so that the custom of intermarriage which prevailed between the royal houses of Egypt and Babylon, at this period, had also its illustration between the houses of Assyria and Babylonia. Karakhardash was succeeded by his son Kadashman-Kharbe I (1337—1334). His mother was Muballitat-Sheru'a, and so it happened that an Assyrian king had his grandson upon the throne of Babylon. This king conducted a campaign against the Sutu, whom he conquered and among whom he settled some of his own loyal subjects. Upon his return he was confronted by a rebellion of the Kassites, in which he was killed. The rebels then placed upon the throne Nazibugash (also called Shuzigash) a man of humble origin and not a descendent of the royal

[1] The name of Shagarakti-Buriash gives us an opportunity of testing the correctness of our chronology. Nabonidus (V R. 64, c. 27—30) records that he found and read the foundation stone of this king in the temple E-ulbar in Sippar-Anunit, and adds that this king ruled 800 years before his time. This shows that Shagarakti-Buriash was ruling about 1350 B.C., which accords exactly with the dates ascertained by other means and given above.

line. As soon as the news of this rebellion reached Assyria, Ashuruballit, desiring to avenge his grandson, marched against Babylonia, killed Nazibugash and placed upon the throne Kurigalzu II, another son of Kadashman-Kharbe I.[1] Kurigalzu II (1332—1295) was probably made king while still young, and his reign was long. We cannot follow its events in detail, but may get a slight view of some of its glories. Many centuries before his day, when Kudur-nankhundi of Elam ravaged in Babylonia, he carried away a small agate tablet, which was carefully preserved in the land of Elam. This happened about 2285 B.C., and now about 1300 B.C. Kurigalzu II invades Elam and conquers even the city of Susa itself. The little agate tablet is recovered, and the victorious Kurigalzu II places it in the temple of Ekur at Nippur with his own brief inscription engraven on its back: "Kurigalzu, king of Karadunyash, conquered the palace of Susa in Elam and presented (this tablet) to Belit, his mistress, for his life."[2] It is to this campaign that the Babylonian Chronicle probably refers in its allusion to the campaign of Kurigalzu against Khurba-

[1] These facts are found in Babylonian Chronicle P, first pub. in translation by Pinches, *Records of the Past*, new series, V, p. 106 ff, and re-translated more accurately by Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, p. 115 ff. With this Chronicle is to be compared the Synchronistic History in which some of the names are incorrectly given. Cf. Winckler, *ib.*

[2] Hilprecht, *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, p. 31.

tila, king of Elam, which resulted so victoriously. After the invasion of Elam, the victorious Kurigalzu also fought with Ramman-nirari I, king of Assyria and worsted him, as the Babylonian Chronicle narrates the story, though the Assyrian Synchronistic History claims the victory in the same conflict for the Assyrians.[1]

Nazi-Maruttash (1294—1269), the next king, also fought with Ramman-nirari I and, according to the Assyrian account, was defeated by him. What the Babylonian account was we do not know, for the Babylonian Chronicle is broken at this place. Of the next king Kadashman-Turgu (1268—1252) we know nothing; and of his successor Kadashman-Buriash (1251—1250) we only know that he was at war with Shalmaneser I king of Assyria,[2] without being able to learn what the outcome was. These constantly recurring wars with Assyria are ominous and indicate the rapid increase of the power of Assyria. They point toward the day of destruction for Babylon, and of glory for the military people, who were beginning to press upon the great city.

The following reigns are almost entirely unknown to us. The names of the kings awaken no response

[1] Compare Chronicle P, III, 20—22 with Synchronistic List I, 18 ff, and see Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 122, 123.

[2] III R, 4. No. 1. Cf. Delitzsch, *Kassäer*, p. 10 and Hilprecht, *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, p. 31.

in our minds and we can only set them down as empty words, they are: Isamme..-ti (?) (1249—1244) and Shagarakti-Shuriash (1243—1231). The Babylonian Chronicle now again comes to our aid and with rather startling intelligence. Tukulti-Ninib, king of Assyria, has invaded Babylon. We do not know what steps led up to this attack. Perhaps the old boundary disputes had once more caused difficulty, perhaps it was only the Assyrian lust for power and territory. But whatever the cause this was no ordinary invasion intended chiefly as a threat. The Assyrian king enters Babylon, kills some of the inhabitants, destroys the city wall, at least partially, and last and worst of all, removes the treasures of the temple and carries away the great god Marduk to Assyria.[1] Here was a sore defeat indeed and an end, for the time, of Babylonian independence. The line of kings is continued during this period of war and invasion with the names of Bibeiashu (1230—1223), Bel-shum-iddina I (1222—1221), Kadashman-Kharbe II (1220—1219) and Ramman-shum-iddina (1218—1213). But the last three of these kings must have been only vassals of Tukulti-Ninib, who was the real king of Babylon for seven years, even though he was represented by these as his deputies.[2] Here is the city

[1] Chronicle P, Col IV, lines 3—6.

[2] See Hommel's acute suggestions for removing the chronological difficulties in Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 138, 139.

of Hammurabi, glorious in its history, ancient in its days, ruled by a king of the small and relatively modern state of Assyria. But the old spirit was not quite dead and after seven years of this domination the Babylonians rose in rebellion, drove the Assyrians from Babylon and made Ramman-shum-usur (1212—1183) king; while Tukulti-Ninib returned to Assyria only to find a rebellion against him, headed by his own son.[1] In this his life was lost, and he went down with the decline of his once brilliant fortunes.

With the reign of Ramman-shum-usur the power of Babylon again began to increase. He attacked Assyria itself, and the Assyrians were scarce able to keep the victorious Babylonians out of their country. The reign of Meli-Shikhu (1182—1168) was also a period of Babylonian aggression against the Assyrian king Ninib-apal-ekur,[2] and to such good purpose that the next Babylonian king, Marduk-aplu-iddina (1167—1155), saw the Assyrians once more confined to their narrow territory, stripped of all their conquests; and was able to add to his name, the proud titles "King of Kishshati, King of Sumer and Akkad"[3]—in token of the extension once more of Babylonian dominion over nearly the whole of Mesopotamia. But when

[1] Chronicle P, IV. 7—11.
[2] Synchronistic History II, 3—8.
[3] IV R, 41, I, 20.

Ashurdan became king of Assyria, before the end of the reign of Marduk-aplu-iddina, there was another reversal of fortunes, though this time the change was not so sudden nor so great. Ashur-dan fought with the next Babylonian king Zamama-shum-iddina (1154) and succeeded in winning back some of the cities in the ever debateable land between Assyria and Babylonia,[1] and thus gave proof that the Assyrian power was again waxing strong. The next Kassite king Bel-shum-iddina (1153—1151) reigned also but a short time, and the very brevity of these reigns may perhaps, as often, indicate that the period was filled with strife. Assyria was certainly threatening the Babylonian empire, for the long reign of Ashur-dan gave time for the carrying out of extensive plans, and the power was plainly not wanting.

With Bel-shum-iddina ends the great Kassite dynasty, which had ruled for so many centuries in the queenly city. Its advent was heralded by war, and by internal dissensions in the last preceding dynasty; and its approaching end was indicated in like manner.

[1] Synchronistic History III, 9—12.

CHAPTER IV.

The Dynasty of Pashe.

The cause of the downfall of the great Kassite dynasty is unknown to us. It may have been due to an uprising of the Semites against foreign domination, with the war cry of "Babylonia for the Babylonians", a cry which in various languages has oft resounded among men and won many a national triumph.

The Babylonian King List names the new dynasty, the dynasty of Pashe, and it appears to have reigned in Babylon a period of one hundred and thirty two years.[1] The list is so badly broken that but few of the names have been retained, and we are once more forced to seek other means of restoring the names from notices in other documents. There were eleven kings in the dynasty, of which we can now secure five names entire and three additional names in part. In the course of the fragmentary narrative which is to follow, we can set forth the sources that are relied upon to give us some of the names.

[1] This is the result of Peiser's calculations in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* VI, pp. 268, 269. Cf. the confirmation by Knudtzon's edition.

The names of the first two kings of the dynasty who ruled seventeen and six years respectively (1150—1134 and 1133—1128) are lost and cannot yet be restored. The third king of this dynasty was Nebuchadnezzar I. (1127—1117).[1] This king exhibits once more the spirit almost of a Hammurabi. His victories are brilliant and his defeats only evidence the hopelessness of the cause of Babylonia, and the vigor of his efforts to save the state. When he began to reign Mutakkil-Nusku was probably king of Assyria, and in him lived the traditions of the glorious reign of Ashur-dan, who had once more carried the Assyrian arms to victory. Assyria was preparing to contest with Babylonia for the possession of the kingdom of Kishshati, and ultimately even for Babylonia itself. In the reign of the next Assyrian king, by name Ashur-rish-ishi, came the first great contest,—the beginning of the struggle for supremacy between the two great nations. The seat of war was no longer in the old debateable country south of Assyria, but was transferred into Northern Mesopotamia along the Euphrates.

[1] Hilprecht has tried, with great learning and acuteness, to prove that Nebuchadnezzar I., was the first king of this Dynasty, (*Old Babylonian Inscriptions* I. pp. 38—44) but without success. Delitzsch has shown that the name of Nebuchadnezzar could not have stood in the first place on the king List (*Assyriologische Miscellen*, p. 186) and Winckler has shown that this view cannot be reconciled with the Assyrian chronology. (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 28, 29 and *Altorientalische Forschungen*, p. 131.)

In this war Nebuchadnezzar was defeated and forced to return to Babylon. The kingdom of Kishshati was annexed to Assyria, and the Babylonian king was compelled to abandon the title.

But Nebuchadnezzar though defeated in his efforts to hold the kingdom of Kishshatiwas still a great conqueror. Babylonia had, for centuries, suffered from the oft repeated raids of the Elamites. To end this ever threatening danger, Nebuchadnezzar invaded Elam and thoroughly reduced the country after a long and perilous war, which finds mention in both of his chief inscriptions.[1] But into the far north also, against the Lulumi, afterwards reduced by the Assyrians, did he carry on a successful campaign and then marched victoriously even into Syria,[2] a feat accomplished by no Babylonian king for centuries.

Nebuchadnezzar I. was succeeded by Bel-nadin-aplu (1116—1109) whose reign furnishes no event of importance known to us. In the reign of his successor Marduk-nadin-akhe (1108—1084)[3] the Assyrians displayed, in a

[1] (a) V R, 55—57 and Hilprecht, *Freibrief Nebuchadnezzar's*. S. A. Smith, *Assyrian Letters* IV and Meissner in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* IV, pp. 259 ff (by latter mistakenly ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar II).

[2] Proceedings of the *Society of Biblical Archaelogy* 1882, p. 10 and compare Hilprecht *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, p. 41.

[3] This date is confirmed by a statement of Sennacherib (*Bavian*, 48—50) that he took away from Babylon same gods which had been carried thither by Marduk-nadin-akhe 418 years before. This was in 689 B.C., and the carrying off of the gods by Marduk-nadim-akhe took place in 1107 (689 and 418), in which year he was ruling according to our chronology.

still clearer light, the power which was finally to put the destinies of all Western Asia in their hands. The throne of Assyria was now occupied by Tiglathpileser I., one of the greatest warriors of antiquity. Against him the weakened power of Babylonia was of little use. In two campaigns he defeated Marduk-nadin-akhe and marched the whole length of Babylonia. The kingdom of the Four Quarters of the World was also taken from the Babylonians, and Marduk-nadin-akhe was reduced to the possession of Babylonia alone.

Perhaps before these campaigns of Tiglathpileser I., perhaps by some sudden stroke afterwards, Marduk-nadin-akhe had attacked Ekallati and carried away into Babylon the god Ramman and the goddess Shala. These remained away for centuries and were only restored to their place by Sennacherib.

But this was only a slight matter. The main trend of the reign of Marduk-nadin-akhe was toward defeat. Tiglathpileser I. was the grand monarch of Western Asia and the Babylonian king really ruled only by sufferance.

The following Babylonian king Marduk-shapik-zirim (1083—1074) lived in terms of friendship with Ashur-bel-kala, his Assyrian contemporary. After his death Ramman-aplu-iddina (1073—1065) was made king of Babylon and the Assyrian king married his daughter.

The remaining kings of this dynasty are practically unknown to us, the names of only three of them having been preserved in a fragmentary condition. The Assyrian contemporary documents make it probable that comparative peace existed between the two peoples. The Assyrians were chiefly occupied in the internal strengthening and solidifying of their kingdom; while the Babylonians were unable to undertake any extensive campaigns. With this period our direct Babylonian information becomes more and more fragmentary and even in some cases doubtful. The Babylonian state had lost the key to Western Asia and the Assyrians had found it. Neither state was now making any great efforts, but the future belonged to Assyria for centuries at least, and the sun of Babylonia had set. With this period our survey may properly close.

We have followed the fortunes of the Babylonian cities from the gray dawn of antiquity down the centuries, through good report and evil report. We have watched the cities grow into kingdoms and have witnessed the kingdoms welded into a mighty empire. We have pursued their advance to the very zenith and have seen them decline into subjection. It is a noble history and even in bald outline there is enough of the rich color of the Orient to make a picture for the mind.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

Agade.

Sargon	about 3800 B.C.
Naram Sin	about 3750 B.C.

Kishshati.

Alusharshid	about 3800 B.C.

Guti.

Lasirab	about 3800 B.C.

Lagash.

Urkagina	about 3100 B.C.
Ur-Bau	
Gudea	
Urningirsu	
. . . . .	
Galalama	

Ur.

Urbau	about 2900 B.C.
Dungi	

Amnanu (Uruk).

Singashid	about 2800 B.C.

Isin.

Ishbigarra	about 2700 B.C.
Ur-Ninib	
Bur-Sin I.	
Ishme-Dagan	

Ur (Second Dynasty).

Gungunu	about 2700 B.C.
. . . . .	
Gamil Sin	
Bur-Sin II.	

Larsa.

Nur-Ramman	about 2400 B.C.
Sin-iddina	
. . . . .	
Rim-Sin	about 2300 B.C.

Babylon.

1. Dynasty of Babylon.

Sumu-abi	2399—2285 B.C.
Sumula-ilu	2384—2350
Zabu	2349—2336
Abil-Sin	2335—2318
Sin-muballit	2317—2288
Hammurabi	2287—2233
Samsu-iluna	2232—2198
Ebishum	2197—2173
Ammi-satana	2172—2148
Ammi-saduga	2147—2127
Samsu-satana	2126—2095

2. Dynasty of Shish-ku.

Ma-ilu (?)	2094—2035 B.C.
Ki-anni-bi	2034—1980
Damki-ilishu	1979—1944
Ish-kibal	1943—1929
Shushi	1928—1902
Gulkishar	1901—1847
Kirgal-dara-bar	1846—1797
A-dara-kalama	1796—1769
Akur-ul-anna	1768—1743
Milam-kurkurra	1742—1736
Ea-gamil (?)	1735—1727

3. Dynasty of Kassites.

Gandish	1726—1711
Agum-machir	1710—1699
Aguiashi (?)	1698—1677
Dushi	1676—1669
Adu-metash	1668—
Urziumash [or Tashshigurumash]	
Agu (*kakrime*)	
. . . . .	
. . . . .	
Karaindash	
. . . . .	
[Father of Kallima-Sin]	
Kallima-Sin	
Burnaburiash I	
Kurigalzu I	
Burnaburiash II	about 1397—1373
Kudur-Turgu [or Bel-]	about 1372—1365
Shagarakti-Buriash	about 1364—1348
Kara-Khardash	1347—1338

3. Dynasty of Kassites (continued).

Kadashman-Kharbe I	1337—1334 B.C.
Nazubugash [or Shuzigash]	1333
Kurigalzu II	1332—1295
Nazi-Maruttash	1294—1269
Kadashman-Turgu	1268—1252
Kadashman-Buriash	1251—1250
Is-am-me- . . . . . ti(?)	1249—1244
Shagarakti-Shuriash	1243—1231
Bibeiashu	1230—1223
Bel-shum-iddina	1222—1221
Kadashman-Kharbe II	1220—1219
Ramman-shum-iddina	1218—1213
Ramman-shum-usur	1212—1183
Meli-Shikhu	1182—1168
Marduk-aplu-iddina	1167—1155
Zamama-shum-iddina	1154
Bel-shum-iddina	1153—1151

4. Dynasty of Pashe.

1.	1150—1134
2.	1133—1128
Nebuchadnezzar I	1127—1117
Bel-nadin-aplu	1116—1109
Marduk-nadin-akhe	1108—1084
Marduk-shapik-zirim	1083—1074
Ramman-aplu-iddina	1073—1065
. . . . .	1064—1043
Marduk-bel . . .	1042—1041
Marduk-zer . . .	1040—1028
Nabu-shum . . .	1027—1019

PRINTED BY W. DRUGULIN, LEIPZIG.

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

DS71 .R75
Outlines of the history of early
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00001 7758